



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/808,906

03/25/2004

William B. Bellis SR.

BEL.206

7405

24062 7590 09/02/2008  
CAMORIANO & ASSOCIATES  
8225 SHELBYVILLE ROAD  
LOUISVILLE, KY 40222

EXAMINER

PHILIPPE, GIMS S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/02/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/808,906	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BELLIS, WILLIAM B.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Gims S. Philippe	<b>Art Unit</b> 2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 12-19 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment received on May 23, 2008 has been fully considered and entered, but the arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 5, 7-10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meng-Suen (US Patent no. 6,702,445) in view of White (US Patent Application Publication no. 2003/0174292 A1) and further in view of Kyhl (US Patent no. 5025320).

Regarding claim 1, Meng-Suen discloses in fig. 4 an image transfer device (See Abstract) , comprising a box including walls defining an inlet opening and an outlet opening (See fig. 4, box 36, and col. 8, lines 18-30); a screen (See fig. 4, screen of frame 140 and col. 8, lines 23-28); a first mirror (See col. 8, lines 36-37), wherein said openings, screen and first mirror are aligned such that, when an image is projected through said inlet opening and is reflected off of said first mirror onto said screen to form

Art Unit: 2621

a screen image, the screen image can be viewed by looking through both said outlet opening and said first mirror (See Fig. 3, items 150, 156 and 158, col. 8, lines 27-42).

It is noted that Meng-Suen is silent about the first mirror being a two-way mirror as claimed in the claim.

However, White discloses a first mirror as being a two-way mirror and having first and second sides, wherein the openings, screen and first mirror are aligned (See White paragraphs [0012 and 0014]).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying Meng-Suen's first and second mirror set by incorporating White's first mirror as being a two-way mirror and having first and second sides, wherein the openings, screen and first mirror are aligned such that, when an image is projected through the inlet opening and is reflected off of the first mirror onto the screen to form a screen image, the screen image can be viewed by looking through both the outlet opening and the first mirror. The motivation for providing such a modification in Meng-Suen is to provide a projection system adapted to output projected image along an image beam path and to achieve a large image without the problems incurred by projecting through a two-way mirror as taught by White (See White paragraphs [0010, lines 7-9, paragraph [0012] lines 12-16]).

It is also noted that the proposed combination of Meng-Suen and White does not specify that when an image is projected through the inlet opening and is reflected off of the first mirror onto the screen to form a screen image, the screen image can be viewed by looking through both the outlet opening and the first mirror as specified in the claim.

However, Kyhl provides an image transfer device wherein when an image is projected through the inlet opening and is reflected off of the first mirror onto the screen to form a screen image, the screen image can be viewed by looking through both the outlet opening and the first mirror (See Kyhl col. 3, lines 11-20 and lines 53-67).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying the image projector of the proposed combination of Meng-Suen and White by incorporating Kyhl's step wherein when an image is projected through the inlet opening and is reflected off of the first mirror onto the screen to form a screen image, the screen image can be viewed by looking through both the outlet opening and the first mirror. The motivation for performing such a modification in the proposed combination of Meng-Suen and White is to provide unobstructed view as taught by Kyhl (See Kyhl col. 1, lines 63-68 and col. 2, lines 1-2).

As per claims 5 and 7-10, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the above rejection of claim 1.

It is noted that while Meng-Suen suggest first and second mirrors aligned to reflect the image onto the screen (See Meng-Suen col. 8, lines 24-40), it does not particularly provides the design details claimed in claims 5, and 7-9.

However, to support Meng-Suen White provide analogous details arrangements similar to what have been claimed wherein a two-way mirror is provided to reflect the image projected on a screen (See White paragraph [0077]), a matte black panel is

Art Unit: 2621

provided so that it does not superimpose an image of the projector (See White paragraph 0078]). Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying Meng-Suen's image transfer device by incorporating White's teachings to provide the different claimed arrangement.

As per claim 11, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above rejection of claim 1. In addition, Meng-Suen further provides a projector platform aligned with said inlet opening, including means for adjusting the pitch and roll of said projector platform; and a recorder platform aligned with said outlet opening, including means for adjusting the pitch and yaw of said recorder platform (See Meng-Suen col. 9, lines 7-27). The applicant should note that the motor will contribute to the means for adjusting the claimed pitch and roll and pitch and yaw.

4. Claims 2-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meng-Suen (US Patent no. 6,702,445) in view of White (US Patent Application Publication no. 2003/0174292 A1) and Kyhl as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Patels et al. (US Patent no. 3718760).

Regarding claims 2-4 and 6, it is noted that the combination of Meng-Suen and White is silent about controlling the tilt of the mirror to enable centering of the image on the screen as specified in the claims.

However, Patels provides the means for controlling the tilt of the mirror as claimed (See Patels col. 3, lines 8-14).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying the proposed combination of Meng-Suen and white by incorporating Patels' means for controlling the tilt of the mirror. The motivation for providing such a modification in the proposed combination of Meng-Suen and White is to prevent the adverse effect of the image quality by enabling a compensation of the differences in the optical path lengths and an exact adjustment of the image as taught by Patels. The applicant should note that springs and screws are necessary and well-known components to provide functions such as opening, tilting. Also, a black cover for inner surface wall of a box in an image transfer device is necessary to protect the film. Therefore, such items are rather considered obvious modification provided in a design choice.

5. Claims 12-19 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gims S. Philippe whose telephone number is (571) 272-7336. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10:30-7:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2621

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gims S Philippe  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2621

/G. S. P./  
/Gims S Philippe/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621